

Request for Proposals

Evaluation Study of California's High Priority Schools Grant Program

July 2004

Letter of Intent Due:

Monday, August 16, 2004

Proposal Due Date:

Friday, September 24, 2004

Proposal Cost Limit:

\$1,005,868.00

Lana Zhou – Evaluation, Research and Analysis
California Department of Education
Assessment and Accountability Branch
Policy and Evaluation Division
1430 N Street, Suite 4206
Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 319-0437

Fax: (916) 319-0153

Email: lzhou@cde.ca.gov

CONTENTS

I.	PURPOSE.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
III.	SCOPE OF EVALUATION STUDY.....	13
IV.	GENERAL PROPOSAL INFORMATION	20
V.	PROPOSAL SPECIFICATIONS.....	22
VI.	CONTRACT MONITORING	29
VII.	CONTRACT TERMS AND REQUIREMENTS	29
VIII.	PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS	36
IX.	CONTRACT AWARD PROTEST PROCEDURES.....	38
X.	RATING CRITERIA AND EVALUATION FORM	38
ATTACHMENT 1	Nondiscrimination Compliance Statements	
ATTACHMENT 2	Small Business Preference Sheet	
ATTACHMENT 3	California Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Program Requirements with DVBE Participation Goals	
ATTACHMENT 3-A	Documentation of Disabled Veteran Business enterprise Program Requirements	
ATTACHMENT 4	Protest Procedures for Request for Proposals	
ATTACHMENT 5	State of California Drug-Free Workplace Certification	
ATTACHMENT 6	Certificate Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements	
ATTACHMENT 7	California State Travel Program	
ATTACHMENT 8	Letter of Intent to Apply	

Evaluation Study of California's High Priority Schools Grant Program

Letter of Intent Due Date: 4:00 p.m., Monday, August 16, 2004

Proposal Due Date: 10:00 a.m., Friday, September 24, 2004

I. Purpose

Through this Request for Proposals (RFP) the California Department of Education (CDE) is seeking proposals from eligible bidders to conduct an evaluation study of the implementation, impacts, costs, and benefits of the High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) in accordance with the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999 (PSAA) and Senate Bill (SB) 508.

Pursuant to SB 508, Chapter 42, Statutes of 2002, *Education Code* Section 52055.656 mandates the CDE to develop guidelines for a RFP to contract with an independent evaluator to conduct comprehensive evaluation of the HPSGP for low-performing schools. The independent evaluator must prepare a multiyear evaluation of the implementation, impacts, costs, and benefits of the HPSGP and to disseminate the results of the report to the Legislature, the Governor, and other interested parties. The final report should include recommendations for modifications to the program that would increase its effectiveness.

SB 508 requires that the evaluation consider all of the following:

- (1) Pupil performance data, including, but not limited to, results of assessments used to determine whether or not schools have made significant progress towards meeting their growth targets.
- (2) Program implementation data, including, but not limited to, a review of startup activities, community support, parental participation, staff development activities associated with implementation of the program, percentage of fully credentialed teachers, percentage of teachers who hold emergency credentials, percentage of teachers assigned outside their subject area of competence, the accreditation status of the school if appropriate, average size per grade level, and the number of pupils in a multitract, year-round educational program.
- (3) (A) Pupil performance data, and its impact on the API, for each of the following subgroups:
 - (i) English language learners.
 - (ii) Pupils with exceptional needs.
 - (iii) Pupils that qualify for free or reduced price meals and are enrolled in schools that receive funds under Chapter 1 of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T.

Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (P.L. 100-290).

The areas of focus for the evaluation study, as stipulated in SB 508, are the following:

- Implementation of the various components of the HPSGP in California's participating public schools and districts.
- The effectiveness of HPSGP implementation in participating schools and districts.
- The impact of participation in the HPSGP on student academic performance, including the performance of all significant subgroups.
- The overall impact of participation in the HPSGP on school and district personnel, parental involvement, community involvement, and on the district's organization, policies, and practices.

The HPSGP evaluation study will take place over approximately 26 months, starting in October 2004 and ending in December 2006. The actual starting date is contingent upon approval of the contract by the California Department of General Services. Currently, a maximum amount of \$1,005,868.00 is budgeted, contingent upon availability and appropriation of funds. Should the funding amounts change or the HPSGP change materially in fiscal year 2004-05, the CDE will negotiate with the contractor a revised scope of work and accompanying budget.

II. Background

A. Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999

In April 1999, the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) became law in California. Its three major provisions include: an *Academic Performance Index (API)* to measure schools' yearly academic progress; an *Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP)* to assist low-performing schools in improving student academic performance; and a *Governor's Performance Awards Program (GPA)* to provide rewards and incentives to schools for increasing student academic performance. Assembly Bill (AB) 961, Chapter 747, Statutes of 2001, established the High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) within the PSAA. The HPSGP provides additional resources to the lowest performing schools in California to be used for raising student academic achievement.

1) Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is the cornerstone of the PSAA. The purpose of the API is to measure the academic performance and growth of schools. The API which is a numeric index that ranges from a low of 200 to a high of 1000, summarizes the results of academic assessments across several subject areas. The statewide API performance target for all schools is 800. A school's growth is

measured by how well it is moving toward that goal. More information on the API can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/ap/index.asp>.

2) Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program

The Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) which was established as part of the PSAA in 1999, aims to assist low-performing schools in California with improving student academic performance. The first year of the program was focused on planning and the next two or three years, depending upon whether or not schools made progress, were focused on implementing the plan.

The II/USP was first implemented in 1999 when schools scoring in the bottom half of the statewide distribution on the SAT-9 for two consecutive years (1998 and 1999) were invited to submit an application to participate. There were three cohorts, respectively, in 1999, 2000 and 2001, each of which had 430 schools representing a range of grade levels, API deciles and geography. Schools in the last two cohorts had API scores in the lower five deciles and did not meet their API growth targets during the qualifying year. More information on II/USP can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/iu/index.asp>.

3) The Governor's Performance Award

The PSAA (*Education Code* Section 52057a) required the State Board of Education (SBE) to establish a Governor's Performance Award Program (GPA). The program provides monetary and/or non-monetary awards to schools that meet or exceed their API growth targets and that demonstrate comparable improvement in academic achievement by all numerically significant ethnic and socio-economically disadvantaged subgroups within schools. More information about this program can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/sr/gp/index.asp>.

4) High Priority Schools Grant Program

Assembly Bill 961, Chapter 747, Statutes of 2001, established the High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) for Low Performing Schools within the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999. This program is intended to assist the lowest performing schools in the state in raising student academic achievement by offering additional resources.

The Legislative Counsel's Digest for AB 961 reads as follows:

This bill (AB 961, Chapter 749) would establish the High Priority Schools Grant Program for Low Performing Schools within the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999. The bill would require the Superintendent of Public Instruction to invite schools ranked in the five lowest deciles of the API to participate in the IIUSP and the High Priority Schools Grant Program for Low Performing Schools. Priority for participation would be given to schools ranked in the lowest deciles, as specified. Participation in the II/USP would be required in order to receive funding under the program established by this bill. The bill would require a school to develop and submit an action plan containing specified components. The bill would require a school district to report certain information annually to the Superintendent of Public Instruction regarding a participating school's progress toward achieving specified goals.

Eligibility Requirements

AB 961 requires that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction invite schools ranked in deciles 1 to 5, according to the statewide 2000 Academic Performance Index (API), to participate in the HPSGP. First priority for participation was given to schools ranked in decile 1 on the API, and second priority was given to the schools ranked in decile 2. Within each decile, priority was given to the lowest-ranked schools. Participation is voluntary and contingent upon the availability of funding. Due to limited funding, only schools in decile 1 have had the opportunity to participate.

The implementation of the HPSGP was launched for the 2002-2003 school year. Early in 2001, all schools in decile 1 according to 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 API were invited to submit their application to participate in the program. Of the 758 schools that applied 568 were approved by State Board of Education (SBE) in June 2002 with a total funding of \$217 million. In May and June 2003, the SBE approved an additional 56 and 29 schools, respectively, to participate in the program. In November 2003 12 schools were added to the program with an additional funds of 4.5 million. Though approval of funding for these schools occurred later into the first implementation year of 2002-2003, the schools were nonetheless held responsible for making progress the entire year.

Level of Funding and Number of Participants

Beginning in 2002-03, schools participating in the HPSGP received \$400 per student, with a \$200 per student matching requirement. Schools have 24 months from September 2002 to meet API growth targets. Over 665 schools have participated in the HPSGP since its inception. Of these schools, over one-half receive funding only from the HPSGP, the rest of the schools receive funds from the HPSGP and the II/USP or the Comprehensive School Reform Program (CSR).

Basic Program Requirements

Schools participating in the HPSGP must address specific areas of improvement that include the following seven major components:

- Appropriate use of state and local assessments to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Action Plan and the impact on student achievement;
- Use of specific approaches or strategies to improve student achievement in reading/language arts;
- Use of specific approaches or strategies to improve student achievement in mathematics;
- Use of specific strategies to provide every K-8 student with State Board of Education (SBE) adopted instructional materials and every 9-12 student standards-aligned instructional materials, including English learners;

- Use of specific strategies to reduce the number of under-credentialed and inexperienced teachers at the school site to at least the district average;
- Provision of professional development activities that address standards-based instruction, including SBE-approved and standards-aligned instructional materials; and
- Design and implementation of an effective program for involving parents in the educational system.

The Action Plan serves as a blueprint for the school and community to focus on raising student achievement to meet the school's academic growth targets. The HPSGP allows schools "to use an existing plan instead of drafting a new action plan...if the existing plan meets the requirements pursuant to subdivisions (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) of Education Code 52054." (See *Education Code* Section 52054.3) The following issues must be addressed in the Action Plan.

- Identify the current barriers at the school and district toward improvement in pupil academic achievement and the underlying causes for low achievement.
- Identify school-wide and district-wide strategies for overcoming these barriers.
- Analyze the disaggregated pupil achievement data and other indicators to determine whether all groups and types of pupils make adequate academic progress toward short-term growth targets and long-term performance goals. The disaggregated data addressed in the plan shall, at a minimum, provide information regarding the achievement of: English language learners; pupils with exceptional needs; pupils who qualify for free and reduced price meals; and all pupils in all numerically significant subgroups identified on the API Base Reports.
- Specify short-term academic objectives pursuant to *Education Code* 52052 for a two-year period that will allow the school to make adequate progress toward the growth targets established for pupil achievement as measured by all data available to the school.
- Set annual academic growth targets at least as high as those adopted by the SBE.
- Describe how state and local assessments are used to modify instruction and improve student achievement.
- Describe the effective allocation of resources and management of the school linked to overcoming the barriers to increasing student academic achievement.

- Review and include the school and district conditions identified in the School Accountability Report Card pursuant to *Education Code* Section 33126.
- Review and include the school and school district crime statistics that negatively affect student achievement (*Penal Code* Section 628.5).
- Describe the process administrators and teachers will use to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Action Plan and its impact on student achievement.
- Describe a strategy to focus on increasing pupil literacy and achievement for all students with special emphasis on English language learners (ELL), and numerically significant subgroups. At a minimum, this strategy shall include a plan to achieve the following goals:
 - (A) Each pupil will be provided appropriate instructional materials aligned with academic and content standards adopted by the SBE as required by law. If indicated, discuss how any lack of instructional materials is being addressed.
 - (B) Each subgroup will demonstrate increased achievement based upon API results by the end of the implementation period.
 - (C) Each English language learner will demonstrate increased performance based on the English Language Development test required by E.C. section 60810 and the achievement test required pursuant to E.C. section 60640.
- Describe a strategy to attract, retain, and fairly distribute the highest quality staff at the school. At a minimum, this strategy shall include teachers, administrators, and support staff, and shall include a plan to achieve the following goals:
 - (A) An increase in the number of credentialed teachers working at the school site.
 - (B) By the end of the implementation period eligible teachers and, where appropriate, instructional aides and paraprofessionals who directly assist with classroom instruction, participate in the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program established by AB 466. Schools should arrange for staff participation in these professional development programs as soon as possible and must schedule trainings to be completed prior to the end of the grant period.

- (C) By the end of the implementation period, administrators must participate in AB 75, the Principal Training Program, prior to the end of the grant period.
- Describe a strategy to change the culture of the school community to recognize parents and guardians as partners in the education of their children, and to prepare and educate parents and guardians in the learning and academic progress of their children. At a minimum, this strategy shall include:
 - (A) A commitment to develop a school-parent compact as required by E.C. section 51101.
 - (B) A plan to achieve the goal of maintaining or increasing the number and frequency of personal parent and guardian contacts each year at the school site.
 - (C) An increase in school-home communications, including home language communication, designed to promote parent and guardian support for meeting state standards and core curriculum components.
 - (D) A plan for increasing the number of bilingual personnel at the school site.
- Address the issues of facilities, curriculum, instructional materials, and support services by describing a strategy to provide an environment with high quality curriculum and instruction aligned with the academic content and performance standards adopted pursuant to *E.C.* section 60605 and English language development standards adopted pursuant to *E.C.* section 60811. At a minimum, this strategy shall include the goal of providing adequate logistical support including, but not limited to, curriculum, quality instructional materials, support services, and supplies for every pupil.

In addition to the above program requirements, the HPSGP schools and districts are also implementing the various “Essential Program Components for Instructional Success,” which are part of the State’s School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) process. The components are 1) SBE-adopted instructional programs; 2) instructional time for the adopted core instructional programs; 3) school principals’ training; 4) fully credentialed teachers and professional development; 5) development of an assessment and monitoring system; 6) instructional assistance and support for teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics; 7) teacher grade level or department/subject matter collaboration; 8) lesson pacing schedules to ensure content coverage for elementary and middle schools and SBE-approved intervention programs for high school students; and 9) fiscal support of the instructional programs in the school plan.

Failure to meet academic growth targets will result in review by the State Board of Education. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction has the discretion, with approval of the State Board of Education, to direct the governing board to adopt strategies that will help schools meet benchmarks. Failure to make significant growth (pursuant to a definition to be adopted by the State Board of Education in July 2004) 36 months from September 2002 will result in interventions or sanctions by the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Requirements to Participate in Other Legislative Programs

The legislation specifies that to receive funding under the program, HPSGP schools must automatically participate in the II/USP. The HPSGP ties together several other legislative incentive programs that have been made available to schools and districts such as AB 466 and AB 75. Schools receiving HPSGP funding must ensure that their eligible teachers participate in the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program established by AB 466. Principals in such schools must, likewise, participate in the Principal Training Program created by AB 75. All participating HPSGP schools must agree to purchase and provide each student with standards-aligned mathematics and reading/language arts instructional materials adopted by the State Board of Education in January 2001 and January 2002, respectively.

Reporting and Data Collection

Each year, the district is required to submit to the CDE for each participating school an evaluation of the impact, costs, and benefits of the program with an analysis of the reasons why participating schools have or have not met the growth targets. The submission of this evaluation is a condition of receiving funds and it is required to ensure that the school is progressing towards meeting the goals of each of the essential components of its school Action Plan. Before submitting the report required by *E.C.* section 52058, the local school board shall review, at a regularly scheduled meeting, the school's progress toward achieving its goals.

The district, on behalf of the schools participating in the HPSGP, is also required to submit information required by *E.C.* section 52055.640. These data are both garnered from existing CDE collections, as prescribed by statute, and through an online data collection administered by the CDE's School Improvement Division. Most of the participating districts have submitted their end of year reports to the CDE. The first annual report includes information about the participating schools' academic achievement results, instructional materials, parent involvement, various after school invention programs, teacher and principal training, and impact of implementation.

B. Data Collection and Statewide Student Information System

High Priority Schools Annual Report

The High Priority Schools office designed an on-line data collection system to meet the reporting requirements under *E.C.* sections 52058 and 52055.640. Districts are required to report on behalf of schools regarding all of the following:

1. Instructional Materials

Acquired State Board adopted texts by grade span (K-3, 4-6, 7-8) for 2002-03. Beginning in 2003-04, reporting will be by each grade, K through 8.

2. Parent Involvement

The number of parents or guardians involved at the school for reasons of discipline, who were involved in classroom/academic activities or who sought information from the school during the 2002-03 school year.

Schools that were unable to provide an unduplicated count of involved parents or guardians for the 2002-03 school year were informed that those data would be collected for the 2003-04 school year. Data were collected as to whether the site had a school-parent compact that met all requirements of *E.C.* section 51101 and 20 USC 6319.

The report asked whether the Parent Involvement Program was meeting the needs of the school action plan, to describe any activities the school engaged in to improve parent participation, and to list any remaining barriers.

3. After-School, Tutoring, or Homework Assistance Programs

The services offered in each program, the number of students enrolled in each program, and the numbers, by type, of staff supporting those programs (Before-School, After-School, and other supplemental support programs).

4. Advanced Placement/UC/CSU Requirement Course Completion

Of the students reported as enrolled on the October 2002 CBEDS School Information Form, schools reported the number of pupils, by course type (name and CBEDS Assignment Code), who successfully completed (with a grade of "C" or better in the 2002-03 school year) advanced placement courses listed in the CBEDS Administrative Manual for 2002-03.

5. Teacher Training

The number of teachers who were enrolled in and completing the initial 40 hours of instruction, those who completed the initial 40 hours of instruction but not the additional 80 hours of follow-up, and those who completed both components of a professional development program pursuant to AB 466.

6. Principal Experience

Whether the principal for 2003-04 possessed a valid California Administrative Services Credential and, if not, the principal's authorization and also the previous administrative and teaching experience the principal had with low performing schools and those schools with a majority of English learners.

7. Impact of Program Implementation

Narrative responses (without limitation) were provided for the following questions:

- a. "From a school level perspective, describe how the specific activities of the II/USP and/or HPSG program have positively and negatively impacted the school. Include in your response the effect of each of those specific activities during the startup and implementation of the program. The response should parallel the specific content areas described in your approved Narrative Summary or Action Plan."
- b. "In addition to the specific activities described above, what other conditions existed within the school that had an impact on whether the school did or did not meet their growth targets?"
- c. "Based on your responses to questions 1 & 2 above, what, if any, changes will the school make to its action plan in 2003-2004."

Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

Current state law requires all students in grades 2-11 to participate in the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. The STAR program, first implemented in 1998, currently includes a norm-referenced test (California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition or CAT/6), the California Standards Tests (CSTs) in English-language arts, mathematics, science, and history/social science (high school level), the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education (SABE/2), and the newly developed California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

California *Education Code* Section 60640(b) requires each school district, charter school, and county office of education to administer the STAR Program assessments to each of its pupils in grades 2-11, unless the pupil is excused by a parent request as allowable by *Education Code* Section 60615).

1. California Achievement Test (CAT/6)

The California Achievement Test (CAT/6) is designated as the norm-referenced test (NRT) for STAR by the State Board of Education (SBE). It was first administered at grades 2-11 and replaced the Stanford 9 that served as the STAR NRT for five years. The CAT/6 measures general achievement in academic knowledge and skills and compares scores of California students with those of a national sample of students in the same grade. In grades 2-11, it assesses reading, language, mathematics, and spelling, and in grades nine to eleven, science. Results are reported as percentile ranks.

2. California Standards Tests

The California Standards Tests (CSTs) are a major component of the STAR Program. The CSTs are developed by educators and test developers specifically for California. They measure progress toward California's state-adopted academic content standards, which describe what students should know and be able to do in each grade and subject tested. Students in grades 2-11 take multiple-choice CSTs in various subjects. Students in grades 4 and 7 complete a writing assessment as

part of the CST English-language arts test. The SBE has adopted five performance standards (levels) for the California Standards Test in English-language arts and Mathematics. Students' performance on these assessments is reported as Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, or Far Below Basic.

3. Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, Second Edition (SABE/2)

The Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, Second Edition (SABE/2) is norm-referenced with a national sample of native Spanish-speaking students. It is given in Spanish to English learners in grades 2-11 to measure achievement in basic academic skills. In grades 2-11, it assesses reading, language, spelling, and mathematics, while in grades 2-3 only word analysis. Spanish-speaking English learners who have been enrolled in California public schools less than 12 months must take the SABE/2 in addition to taking the designated STAR tests in English. The SABE/2 is optional if students have been enrolled 12 months or more.

The SABE/2 report shows the overall performance for total reading, total language, and total mathematics. The overall performance results also show if the student's scores fell in the below-average, average, or above-average range of performance. The percentile scores compare the student's results with scores of a national sample of Spanish-speaking English learners in bilingual classes.

4. California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)

To meet the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), California implemented an alternate assessment for children with disabilities who cannot take part in general statewide assessment programs even with accommodations or modifications. The California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) is the alternate for [California's Standardized Testing and Reporting \(STAR\) Program](#) and is aligned with the State's academic content standards. It promotes access to the general curriculum and reflects professional judgment of the highest learning standards possible for these students. The CAPA was administered statewide for the first time in the Spring 2003. Results are reported at the same five performance levels that the SBE adopted for the CSTs (Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic).

California High School Exit Examination

In addition to the assessments included in the STAR Program, the state in 2001 developed and implemented the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). The CAHSEE represents some of the core content that a high school graduate is expected to know and be able to demonstrate in English-language arts, including a writing assessment, and mathematics. Results for the exam are reported separately by content area. The CAHSEE has been adopted by the SBE for use as the standards-based academic achievement measure in English-language arts and mathematics for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under No Child Left Behind (at the high school level).

The CAHSEE was administered for the first time in 2001 to a voluntary group of 9th grade students. In 2002, the CAHSEE was administered to all 10th grade students who either did not take the exam or did not pass the exam in 2001. Beginning with the Class of 2006, all public school students will be required to pass the exam to earn a high school diploma.

California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS)

The California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) is an annual collection of basic student and staff data that the California Department of Education implemented in 1980. It is a statewide database that has as its data sources county offices of education and school districts. The CBEDS gathers information on staff and student characteristics as well as enrollment and hiring practices. It has given local educational agencies and government organizations critical information on which to base their funding, research, program planning, and policy decisions. It also provides the public with important information about California's educational system.

Three separate forms are used to collect these data: the County/District Information Form, the School Information Form, and the Professional Assignment Information Form. The County/District Information Form (CDIF) collects information on: number of classified staff, gifted and talented education, adult education, service-learning/community service, estimated number of teacher hires, high school graduation requirements, and student inter-district transfer. The School Information Form (SIF) collects information on number of classified staff, school enrollment, high school graduates, high school graduates completing UC/CSU entrance requirements, high school graduates vocational education sequence completion, enrollment in selected high school courses, vocational education enrollment, dropouts, alternative education, technology, class size reduction, educational calendar, health centers, and No Child Left Behind report requirements. The Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) collects information on the school's staff including highest educational level, racial/ethnic designation, gender, birth year, educational service, assignment or course, position, and teaching credentials.

CDE Data Resource Guide

The Data Resource Guide is an on-line catalog of CDE data products. These data products include data collections, databases, and mandated reports. It contains information on what data the CDE collects, manages, and stores; where the data are located; who is the point of contact for the data; and how the data can be accessed and shared. Like a catalog in a library, the Data Resource Guide describes the CDE's data. It does NOT contain the actual data itself. Although all CDE data products are listed in the Data Resource Guide, some of the data may not be available to the public due to federal or state confidentiality laws.

III. Scope of Evaluation Study

The HPSGP evaluation study is to provide information about four major issues delineated in Section 1 of the RFP. Specifically, the study will address the implementation of the various components of the HPSGP in California's participating public schools and districts; the effectiveness of HPSGP implementation in participating schools and districts; the impact of the HPSGP on pupil academic achievement including significant subgroups in participating schools and districts; and the overall impact of the HPSGP on district and schools' policies and practices, personnel, parents, the community, etc., as a result of the program. To this end, the CDE has developed, and the State Board of Education has approved, five evaluation questions for this study.

The audience for this evaluation includes the Governor's Office, the Legislature, the CDE, schools and districts, parents, the business community, and other interested evaluators and educational researchers. To ensure the evaluation's responsiveness to these audiences, a HPSGP Evaluation Advisory Group will be formed to consult with the successful bidder on this evaluation study.

A. Questions to be Addressed

Following are the five evaluation questions, and their related sub-questions, that are to guide the contracted independent evaluator in meeting the purposes of this evaluation study. The questions pertain to program implementation, program impact, and outcomes.

1. How effectively did participating schools and districts implement the HPSGP?
 - a. Identify salient factors, patterns of practices, activities, strategies, and processes used to implement the required components of the program. To what extent did these factors contribute to or detract from successful implementation the HPSGP?
 - b. Identify barriers that hindered implementation of the HPSGP and the extent to which these barriers impeded successful implementation of the program?
 - c. Analyze the extent to which each school's HPSGP Action Plan was implemented as written and evaluate its timeliness. Identify any changes, if any, made to the Action Plan and evaluate the circumstances under which they were made.
2. What are the impacts on, and benefits to, students from a school's participation in HPSGP, based on:
 - a. Results of assessments used to determine whether or not schools have made significant progress towards meeting their growth targets as specified in the PSAA (*Education Code Section 52058c*)?
 - b. Results of disaggregated pupil's performance data for each of the following subgroups, as specified in PSAA (*Education Code Section 52058c*)?

- 1) Major racial and ethnic groups
 - 2) English language learners
 - 3) Pupils with disabilities
 - 4) Pupils with socioeconomic disadvantages
3. What has been the overall impact of participation in the HPSGP on school and district personnel, parents, the community, and on school and district organization, policies, and practices, including but not limited to an examination of the following factors:
- a. The distribution of experienced teachers.
 - b. The number of fully credentialed teachers and teachers who are assigned in their subject area of competence.
 - c. The on-going professional development for teachers and staff required by AB 466 and AB 75.
 - d. The use of State Board of Education adopted instructional materials (K-8) and standards-aligned instructional materials (grades 9-12).
 - e. Parent and community involvement, and partnership between the school and the community.
 - f. The role of the district and the external evaluator, and their effectiveness in providing technical support and assistance in school-wide reform and improvement.
 - g. The strategies, if used, to provide an environment that is conducive to teaching and learning.
 - h. The support for and from teachers, administrators, and staff.
 - i. The strategies, if used, to identify resources to support and sustain the school's comprehensive reform effort.
 - j. The implementation of data systems for student assessment.
 - k. The use of data by district and school administrators and staff to evaluate program effectiveness.
4. What gains in student academic performance have been realized from the investment of HPSGP resources?
- a. Analyze longitudinal academic performance data of schools participating in the HPSGP to identify trends.

- b. Analyze longitudinal academic performance data of schools participating in the HPSGP compared to the academic performance data of all low performing schools in the State and the State as a whole.
 - c. Analyze growth patterns in academic performance of the following three groups of decile 1 schools:
 - 1) funded under HPSGP
 - 2) funded under both HPSGP and II/USP
 - 3) funded under HPSGP and CSR
5. What unintended consequences have resulted from the implementation of the HPSGP?

B. General Approach

In undertaking this study the CDE expects the contractor to collect and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data. The bidder must clearly delineate the data collection and analysis techniques and the relative cost for obtaining the data necessary to answer each of the preceding evaluation questions.

Each proposal must include a detailed evaluation study design that provides a description of the overall evaluation plan. The study design must include specific methods, including instrumentation and data sources, and their relation to tasks and timelines. Appropriate justifications must be provided for each method selected and how the methodology will obtain the information needed to answer the five evaluation questions. The study design must include a conceptual framework for the evaluation, including key variables and indicator definitions. Data elements that could be considered include:

- Statistical analysis of assessment results obtained through the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program.
- Statistical analysis of annual report data available through the online data collection system.
- Cost/benefit and/or cost-effectiveness analysis, as appropriate.
- Questionnaires to participating HPSGP schools and their districts.
- Longitudinal analysis of academic growth patterns.
- Site visits to participating schools and districts.
- Intensive case studies of selected participating schools.
- Interviews and focus groups with school and district personnel, students, parents, and community members.

The bidder must also explicitly state a) the degree to which the evaluation questions can or cannot be answered with the available data; b) other proposed data sources to augment those from the CDE; and c) any anticipated problems in conducting the study and proposed solutions to those problems.

The bidder should make an effort to avoid duplication of data collection to the extent possible. Section II of this RFP describes the types of data collected by the CDE, which include student achievement data, HPSGP implementation annual reports, and such data as enrollment, staffing, graduates and dropouts, course enrollment, school finances, and school and student demographics collected on a regular basis by the California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS). The CDE Data Resource Guide (DRG) provides information on CDE data products. These data products or information on CDE data products can be accessed at the CDE's Internet website at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/>.

Due to limitations in data collected by the CDE, the bidder must also include strategies to collect data from school districts on program implementation and in-depth information on different subgroups (See RFP Section VIII, Part N, Access to Pupil Records; Confidentiality).

In responding to the specific evaluation questions of this RFP, the bidder must include detailed information about the following issues related to this evaluation study.

Sampling

The bidder must indicate the percentage of schools to be included in this study for qualitative data collection, along with a detailed description of how the bidder will ensure that the samples represent all schools participating in the HPSGP.

Indicators and Benchmarks

The bidder must specify the indicators and benchmarks to be used for assessing and evaluating the "effectiveness" of HPSGP implementation.

Confounding Variables

The bidder must identify and address confounding variables that may affect this study. These may include, but are not limited to, different timelines when funding for the program was made available, types of external evaluators and their level of effectiveness in relation to activities they carried out, the proportion of credentialed and emergency credentialed teachers in the HPSGP schools, school district variations in program data collection and reporting techniques and practices, and the intervening impact of other key state initiatives and requirements such as class size reduction, student promotion and retention policies, and the impact of the STAR Testing Program on student academic achievement.

Data Limitations

The bidder must address limitations of available data sources for addressing the five major evaluation questions in the RFP Section III, Part A. The bidder must also

propose data-collection strategies that take these limitations into account while providing for an evaluation research design that is rigorous in examining the long-term effects of the HPSGP on pupil academic achievement.

C. Roles and Responsibilities of CDE staff

The CDE expects the contractor to work closely with pertinent CDE staff during the entire contract period. Following are the roles and responsibilities that the CDE contract monitor and other pertinent CDE staff members will perform as part of the independent contracted HPSGP evaluation study:

- Work with the contractor on an ongoing basis to keep the contractor informed of changes in legislation and implementation of the HPSGP.
- Coordinate access to relevant state databases.
- Assist in developing data-collection instruments.
- Assist in selecting schools for any intensive study.
- Assist in data-collection activities, including field work such as school visits and focus groups.
- Review all data-collection instruments, including surveys, and interview and site visit protocols.
- Review statistical methods.
- Review qualitative and quantitative data analysis.
- Participate on the HPSGP Evaluation Advisory Group.
- Monitor the ongoing work of the contractor to ensure compliance with contract terms.
- Approve contract changes if necessary.
- Meet and confer with the contractor about study implementation as needed and on a regularly scheduled basis as specified in the RFP.
- Review and approve contractor's draft and final versions of all required reports.

The proposal must address how the bidder intends to collaborate with the CDE staff in carrying out these tasks.

D. The HPSGP Evaluation Advisory Group

The HPSGP Evaluation Advisory Group will consist of the representatives of interested stakeholders such as the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the PSAA Advisory Committee, the Office of the Secretary for Education, the Legislature, the California Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and California schools and districts. Also on the committee will be the CDE contract monitor and other pertinent CDE staff.

The CDE will provide a list of recommended candidates for the contractor to contact and form the advisory group. The contractor is expected to consult with the HPSGP Evaluation Advisory Group about the following aspects of the evaluation:

- Data-collection instruments
- Sampling plans
- Data-collection schedules
- Selection of schools for intensive study
- Data analysis strategies
- Draft evaluation reports
- Issues and concerns

The bidder must describe the steps necessary to convene at least two meetings of the Evaluation Advisory Group during each year of the contract period. Convening tasks must include, but are not limited to, notifying members of the meeting data and location, preparing the agenda and supporting materials, and securing the facilities for the meeting. The proposal must include a description of how the bidder intends to present information and secure responses from the Evaluation Advisory Group about the preceding items throughout the contract period other than at the group's scheduled meetings. The bidder must include in the cost/price proposal costs for convening the meetings, including the travel costs for members as described in RFP Section V, Part D.

E. Required Products and Reports

The contractor must provide the CDE's Policy and Evaluation Division the following products and reports:

- 1) Detailed design of the evaluation study.
- 2) All data collection instruments to be used in the evaluation.
- 3) Any materials intended for use by schools and/or school districts participating in the evaluation.

- 4) Monthly invoices.
- 5) Monthly written progress reports of work activities that accompany monthly invoices.
- 6) Quarterly written reports, including discussion of issues and concerns, and a summary of data and/or findings from work completed to date.
- 7) Annual HPSGP evaluation report.
- 8) Final HPSGP evaluation report, with data collection instruments developed for this study and supporting data files.

F. HPSGP Evaluation Report Content and Timeline

The contractor will provide evaluation reports to the CDE that answer the five central evaluation questions proposed in this RFP. As required by SB 508, a preliminary report needs to be disseminated to the Legislature, the Governor, and interested parties each year no later than June 30. By November 1 each contract year, the contractor will submit to the CDE a draft report for feedback and review. By December 15, a final report will be submitted by the contractor to the CDE that shall include recommendations for necessary or desirable modifications to the programs established pursuant to SB 508.

The following is the timeline for various reports about the HPSGP evaluation study that the contractor is expected to submit to the CDE:

December 15, 2004	Revised Evaluation Study Design
November 1, 2005	Year 1 Draft Report
December 15, 2005	Year 1 Final Report
November 1, 2006	Year 2 Draft Report
December 15, 2006	Year 2 Final Report

All reports must address the five following evaluation questions:

- How effectively did participating schools and districts implement the HPSGP?
- What are the impacts on, and benefits to, students from a school's participation in HPSGP?
- What has been the overall impact of participation in the HPSGP on school and district personnel, parents, the community, and on the school and district organization, policies, and practices?
- What gains in student academic performance are realized from the investment of HPSGP resources?

- What unintended consequences have resulted from the implementation of the HPSGP?

The November and December reports will include the most current student achievement data in the analysis and all implementation data from the prior school year. The first year of the evaluation study will need to study and evaluate program implementation during the prior two years (2002-2003 and 2003-2004) in addition to the current year (2004-2005). However, quantitative data for the first two years is already available in various CDE data systems (see RFP Section II, Part B).

The contractor must allow sufficient time in the preparation, completion, and presentation of these reports in advance of the preceding due dates to allow for the review and comment of the Evaluation Advisory Group and of the contract monitor. In addition, the contractor must also allow adequate time for internal CDE review and processing time in advance of the CDE's submission of the completed versions of the required reports to the Governor and the Legislature. Bidders must address these two factors when describing their Work Plan in their proposals (see RFP Section V, Part C).

G. Other Products

In addition to these deliverables, the bidder must propose other products that the bidder believe will enhance this evaluation, including less technical, "user-friendly" reports (e.g., booklets or handbooks) about the HPSGP evaluation findings and recommendations for school and district personnel, parents, and community members, and for other HPSGP program participants.

IV. General Proposal Information

A. Eligible Bidders

Public or private corporations, agencies, organizations, or associations may submit proposals to contract for the independent HPSGP evaluation study.

Applicants must be legally constituted and qualified to do business within the State of California (registered with the Secretary of State). With the exception of bidders whose legal status precludes incorporation (i.e., public agencies, sole proprietorships, partnerships), bidders that are not fully incorporated by the deadline for submitting proposals will be disqualified.

B. Contract Funding and Time Period

The HPSGP evaluation study will take place over a period of approximately 26 months, starting about September 2004 and ending December 2006. The actual starting date is contingent on approval of the contract by the California Department of General Services. Currently, a maximum of \$1,005,868.00 is budgeted for the entire period of this evaluation. The CDE reserves the right to cancel the contract at any time before the end of the contract period if it believes the contractor has not performed, or is unable to perform, in accordance with the contract. The contract scope of work will be amended if

actual funding levels are less than anticipated or the HPSGP changes materially in 2004-2005.

C. Letter of Intent to Apply

Bidders are required to submit a Letter of Intent (Attachment 8), mailed, e-mailed or faxed, that must be received by **4:00 pm, Monday, August 16, 2004**. The Letter of Intent does not require an organization to submit a proposal, however a proposal will not be accepted unless a Letter of Intent is submitted on time.

The *Letter of Intent* must be signed by the bidder or the bidder's representative and include the title of the person signing the Letter of Intent and show the date of submission. In the case of e-mailing an electronic signature must be affixed. Questions regarding this RFP may be included with your Letter of Intent and must be mailed, emailed or faxed by **4:00 pm, Monday, August 16, 2004**.

The Letters of Intent and questions regarding this RFP should be mailed, emailed or faxed to:

Lana Zhou - Evaluation, Research and Analysis Unit
California Department of Education
Policy and Evaluation Division
1430 N Street, Suite 4206
Sacramento, CA 95814

Fax: (916) 319-0153
E-mail: lzhou@cde.ca.gov

By 4:00 pm, Friday, August 27, 2004 the CDE will respond to all questions submitted by potential bidders. Responses to the questions will be emailed to all bidders submitting a Letter of Intent. Please use your company's letterhead paper for inquiries and include your email address.

D. RFP Schedule

Monday, July 26, 2004	Initial RFP release date
4:00 p.m., Monday, August 16, 2004	Letter of Intent due to CDE for those applicants wishing to continue in the competition.
4:00 p.m., Monday, August 16, 2004	All questions, by mail, email or fax, due.
4:00 p.m., Friday, August 27, 2004	Response to all questions faxed or emailed to all bidders submitting a Letter of Intent.
Friday, September 24, 2004	Proposals due to CDE by 10:00 a.m.
Monday through Wednesday, September 27-29, 2004	Review of technical proposals for eligibility
10:00 a.m., Thursday, September 30, 2004	Public opening of cost/price proposals.
Friday, October 1, 2004	Preliminary notification of the successful bidder for recommendation to the State

	Board of Education.
Friday – Thursday, October 1-7, 2004	Five-day posting period in the CDE lobby.
Friday, October 8, 2004	Contract start date (anticipated).

V. Proposal Specifications

A. General Requirements

It is essential that the proposal submitted comply with the format and content requirements detailed in this section. All proposals must be clearly labeled on the outside of the envelope with the proposal title as follows:

*Proposal Submission:
Evaluation Study of the High Priority Schools Grant Program*

Each bidder must submit to the CDE a proposal that provides proof of the bidder's experience, qualifications to conduct the required activities, approaches to completing these activities, and separately the estimated costs for doing so. Transmission by electronic mail (modem/internet) or facsimile (fax) shall not be accepted. One (1) original and nine (9) copies of both the technical and cost proposals are due by **10:00 a.m., Friday, September 24, 2004**, at the CDE at the following address:

Lana Zhou - Evaluation, Research and Analysis Unit
California Department of Education
Policy and Evaluation Division
1430 N Street, Suite 4206
Sacramento, CA 95814

If the proposal is hand-delivered, sufficient time should be allowed for the submission to go through all of the following steps to reach Suite 4206:

- Check in with security guard in the lobby.
- Security guard to phone the Policy and Evaluation Division (Lana Zhou at 916-319-0437 or Division main line 916-319-0869) to obtain authorization for bidder/bidder's representative to enter Suite 4206.
- Bidder/bidder's representative to deliver the package(s) to Suite 4206.

**ALL PROPOSALS MUST BE RECEIVED AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS
10:00 a.m., Friday, September 24, 2004**

The bidder is responsible for ensuring that the proposal is received in the Policy and Evaluation Division (Suite 4206) by the date and time specified. Proposals not received by the date and time specified will not be accepted and will be returned to the sender

marked "LATE RESPONSE." Each proposal must be complete when submitted. Incomplete proposals will be considered noncompliant and will not be reviewed.

The successful bidder's Technical Proposal, along with the Cost Proposal, will be incorporated into the final contract, which is a public document. All bidders' Technical Proposals and Cost Proposals that advance to bid opening are public documents. All Technical Proposals and Cost Proposals submitted pursuant to this RFP will become the property of the State of California.

The terms and conditions within the State's proposed agreement as set forth herein are not negotiable. If a proposal is submitted that in any way deviates, alters, modifies, or otherwise qualifies any of the terms herein, such act will constitute a basis for rejection of the proposal.

DO NOT include the budget or any financial or price information with the technical proposal sections.

B. Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Goal

May be waived by the Contracts Office dependent upon timeline, opportunities for subcontracting, etc.

Public Contract Code Section 10115 requires that State contracts have a participation goal of three percent (3%) for Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises (DVBE) as defined in *Military and Veterans Code* Section 999 (see Attachment A). In addition, Public Contract Code Section 10115.2 requires that contracts be awarded "to the lowest responsible bidder meeting or making good faith efforts to meet these goals."

To be responsive to this RFP, the bidder must comply with either Option A or Option B below and so indicate on Attachment 3-A:

Option A. Commitment to full DVBE participation (Meeting the Goal):

- The bidder is a DVBE and commits to performing at least three percent (3%) of the bid amount itself or in combination with other DVBE(s); or
- Commit to using Office of Small Business and DVBE Certification (OSDC) certified DVBE(s) for at least three percent (3%) of the bid amount.

Compliance with "meeting the goal" shall be certified by completing Attachment 3-A (DVBE1). A letter of commitment prepared by other participating DVBE subcontractor(s)/supplier(s), including the goods or services being provided and a copy of the OSDC DVBE certification, must be attached to the DVBE1.

Option B. Good Faith Effort (GFE) performance and documentation requirements must be completely satisfied prior to bid submission. Perform and document the following Steps 1 through 5 on both sides of the attached DVBE1. Failure to document

GFE Steps 1 through 5 as instructed, which includes properly completing and submitting the DVBE1, will result in rejection of the bid. Note: Step 3, Advertisement, is required unless specifically waived for this solicitation, by the CDE.

- Step 1 Contact the CDE's Contracts Office at (916) 322-3035 for assistance in identifying potential DVBEs; and
- Step 2 Contact other state and federal government agencies and local DVBE organizations to identify potential DVBEs that could provide goods/services applicable to this contract (see Attachment 3); and
- Step 3 Advertise in trade papers and papers focusing on DVBEs at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the due date for the proposal; the CDE requires two separate publications (see Attachment 3); and
- Step 4 Invite (solicit) DVBEs who can provide relevant goods and/or services (commercially useful function) relevant to this solicitation. Conducting Steps 1 through 3 produces a list of DVBEs from which potential DVBEs may be chosen. Bidders are advised to contact as many DVBEs [who provide relevant goods and/or services in the applicable location(s)] as possible; and
- Step 5 Consider all responding DVBEs for contract participation. Consideration must be based on business needs for the contract and the same evaluation criteria must be applied to each potential DVBE subcontractor/supplier offering the same goods and services (commercially useful function).

Compliance with "GFE" shall be documented by completion of Attachment 3-A indicating dates/times/contact names for agencies contacted; names of papers used and date(s) of advertising and a copy of the advertisement; names of potential DVBEs solicited and date(s) of solicitation; and names of those considered for participation and, if applicable, the reasons for non-selection. In addition, a letter of commitment prepared by participating DVBE subcontractor(s)/supplier(s), including the goods or services being provided and a copy of the OSDC DVBE certification, must be attached to the DVBE1.

Final determination of either "meeting the goal" or "good faith effort" (this is referred to as "meeting the goal" on p. 21) by the bidder shall be at the sole discretion of the CDE.

C. Technical Proposal Section

The technical proposal must be presented in a narrative form demonstrating the ability to meet all qualifications, requirements, and standards specified in this RFP. The proposal must contain the following sections: Cover Letter, Table of Contents, General Approach, Work Plan, Detailed Evaluation Study Design, Management and Staffing, Related Experience, Examples of Previous Work, References, a completed

Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement, a completed Small Business Preference Sheet, a Drug-free Workplace Certificate, completed Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) participation documentation, and completed Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters.

Proposals are limited to 35 double-spaced pages in no smaller than 10-point font. The 35-page limit applies to the General Approach, Work Plan, Detailed Evaluation Study Design, Management and Staffing, and Related Experience sections. Each page of the proposal must be numbered consecutively at the bottom of the page. The original and each of the nine copies of the proposal must be stapled in the upper left-hand corner.

Do not attach pamphlets, letters of support (except from any proposed subcontractors) or other items that are not specifically requested in this section.

The *Cover Letter* must be signed by an individual qualified to make the offer to perform the work described in the RFP. In the case of organizations, an individual signing this letter must indicate his/her position title, certifying that he/she is authorized to make the offer on behalf of the organization. The *Cover Letter* must also provide an acknowledgement that all information collected, the data collection instruments developed, and reports prepared for, and submitted to the CDE become the CDE's property. Any use of these materials by the contractor for reasons separate from completion of contract requirements, during or subsequent to the contract period, may be done only with the written permission of the CDE. It is incumbent upon the contractor to secure this permission.

If applicable, in the *Cover Letter* the bidder must specify the strategies to be used to obtain confidential pupil records, to maintain their confidentiality, and to dispose of such information at the conclusion of the evaluation study (Section VII, Part N of the RFP).

In the *Cover Letter*, the bidder must attest that it is a public or private corporation, agency, organization or association that is legally constituted and qualified to do business within the State of California (Section IV, Part A of the RFP).

The *Table of Contents* must identify major points of discussion by page.

The *General Approach* must provide an overview of the approach to be taken in addressing the evaluation questions described in the Scope of the HPSGP Evaluation Study (Section III of this RFP).

The *Work Plan* must describe in detail the tasks and activities to be undertaken to accomplish the scope and purpose of the project and produce the required final products. Any anticipated theoretical or practical problems associated with the completion of each task must be discussed, and solutions, alternatives, or contingency plans related to these problems must be proposed as appropriate. The work plan must include proposed task initiation and completion dates by way of a timeline.

The *Detailed Evaluation Study Design* must provide an extensive description of the two-year activities of the evaluation study based on information from this RFP and must include activities related to answering the evaluation questions.

The study design must include specific methods, including instrumentation and data sources, and their relation to tasks and timelines. Appropriate justifications must be provided for each method selected and how the methodology will obtain the information needed to answer the five evaluation questions. The study design must include a conceptual framework for the evaluation, including key variables and indicator definitions (see more on this issue in RFP Section III, Part B). This section must include steps to be taken for collaboration with the Evaluation Advisory Group and CDE staff (see RFP Section III, Part C and D).

If applicable, a written assurance describing how pupil records will be handled in accordance with contract terms and conditions must also be included. Be prepared to collaborate with CDE staff in the development of a human subjects protocol, if applicable, and to have approval from the bidder's Institutional Review Board for conducting the proposed research at the time the award is made.

The *Management and Staffing* section must present a plan for the internal management of contract work that will ensure accomplishment of the tasks. This section must include:

- A staff organizational plan/chart for the evaluation study, identifying by name each staff member to be assigned to the project and showing the project's relationship to the company's structure;
- Lines of responsibility and approval authority;
- The name of the person to act as project manager or director, who must have at least two years of recent experience (one of which must be within the last three years) in managing similar projects of comparable scope and size;
- A clear description of the relationship of each position to the work plan and the amount of time each staff person will spend on project tasks;
- Identification of the individuals proposed to fill professional positions with accompanying resumes that are sufficiently detailed to allow an evaluation of the person's competency and expertise. Accompanying resumes must be included in the Attachment Section of the bidder's response to the RFP.

The *Related Experience* section must describe the experience of the bidder in providing services required, including a discussion of previous related work.

This section must include:

- Evidence that the bidder has a minimum of two years of recent experience (one of which must be within the last three years) in the development and operation of projects similar to that described in this RFP.

In addition, qualified bidders must have experience with, and knowledge of, the following:

- Quantitative research, surveys, sampling methodology, and statistical analysis, and interpretation of standardized tests and other student achievement data.
- Existing achievement data in California schools and the uses thereof for student impact, benefit, and academic achievement analysis sought in this RFP.
- Qualitative research, including content analysis, focus group methodologies, case studies, and interviews.
- Conduct of research and evaluation in low performing schools.
- Current research and literature about school reform and statewide comprehensive, high-stakes school accountability systems.

If a subcontractor is used, this section must specify the tasks to be performed by the subcontractor and must be able to demonstrate the ability of the subcontractor(s) to fulfill the scope of work. Resumes or curriculum vitae must be provided for professional positions to demonstrate appropriate experience. Subcontractor letters of commitment, resumes, or curriculum vitae must be included in the Attachment Section of the bidder's response to the RFP. The bidder **must not include any subcontractor rate information in the technical proposal**. Subcontractor rate information must be included in the cost/price proposal.

The *Examples of Previous Work* section must include at least two samples of an evaluation study design and their accompanying final evaluation reports developed and prepared by the contractor. A bidder must provide at least three copies of such products with the technical proposal.

The *References* section must include at least three client references relevant to the scope and complexity of the services required by this RFP. These references must include a description of the services performed, the date of these services, and the name, address, and telephone numbers of the client references.

The *Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement* (Attachment 1) must be signed and dated with an original signature with each copy of the proposal.

The *Small Business Preference Sheet* (Attachment 2) must be completed. If the preference is being claimed, a copy of the certification letter from OSDG must be included or the date of application if not yet certified.

The *Documentation of Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE)* must be completed (Attachment 3A) in accordance with instructions in Attachment 3 *California DVBE Program Requirements*.

The *Certification Regarding California Drug-Free Workplace* (Attachment 5) must be signed and submitted.

The *Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements* (Attachment 6) must be signed and submitted.

D. The Cost/Price Proposal

The Cost/Price proposal must contain, at a minimum, the following information:

- Labor cost detail, including hourly or billing rates for all personnel and the total number of hours projected for this study, including the amount designated for DVBEs.
- Operating expense detail for line items of \$500 or more including travel, computer software, and the bidder's indirect costs (IDC) for the proposed activities (please note that this contract **does not allow for the purchase of equipment**).
- Travel expenses computed and reimbursed at state travel rates (Attachment 7)
- Identification of costs by task and by total for each year and for the entire project.
- Any subcontractor expenses displayed in the same manner as the preceding breakdown by year if multiyear.
- Costs for the two required one-day meetings with the Evaluation Advisory Group each year. To compute these amounts, the bidder should assume an eight-member meeting twice a year in Sacramento. All Evaluation Advisory Group meeting costs will be the responsibility of the contractor.

Do not include the budget or any related financial information with the technical proposal.

The cost/price proposal must be submitted in a separate sealed envelope. One (1) original and nine (9) copies of both the technical and cost proposals are due by **10:00 a.m., Friday, September 24, 2004**. The outside of the sealed envelope containing the cost/price bid information must read:

Evaluation Study of the High Priority Schools Grant Program

Competitive Bid

Do not open before 10:00 a.m., Thursday, September 30, 2004

Mail to:

Lana Zhou - Evaluation, Research and Analysis Unit
California Department of Education
Policy and Evaluation Division
1430 N Street, Suite 4206
Sacramento, CA 95814

VI. Contract Monitoring

Throughout the period of this evaluation study, the CDE will maintain an ongoing relationship with the contractor. During the evaluation period, the contractor must plan for one-day quarterly meetings in Sacramento with CDE staff. The purpose of the meetings is for the contractor to provide written and verbal briefings about the progress of the evaluation to ensure timelines are being met, to cooperatively resolve issues as they arise, and to share information pertinent to the evaluation. Two of the quarterly meetings can be held in conjunction with the contractor's meetings with the Evaluation Advisory Group. However, the meetings with the CDE and the Evaluation Advisory Group must be separate ones with these different audiences.

CDE staff from the Policy and Evaluation division will monitor this contract through the following mechanisms:

- Contractor written monthly progress reports
- Contractor monthly invoices
- Contractor written quarterly reports
- Contractor draft and final evaluation reports
- Contractor one-day quarterly meetings with CDE staff in Sacramento

The CDE reserves the right to attend and to participate in the contractor's staff, planning, and deliberative meetings about the study, as appropriate or as needed.

VII. Contract Terms and Requirements

A. Compensation

Payments will be made in arrears on a monthly basis upon receipt of an itemized invoice and a progress report of activities. The State shall retain from each payment an amount equal to 10 percent of the payment. The contractor's monthly invoice must show the 10 percent retainage deducted from the monthly billing amount. Release of

the 10 percent retained amount for each year of the evaluation study contract is contingent upon the contractor's satisfactory completion and the CDE's acceptance of the work required during this part of the contract. Upon completion of the two-year contract, a final payment for the contract will not be made until the CDE accepts and approves the contracted work as satisfactorily completed and the State contractor monitor completes a Std. 4 document to this effect.

All travel costs shall be reimbursed at rates not to exceed those established for the CDE's non-represented employees computed in accordance with and allowable pursuant to applicable California Department of Personnel Administration regulations (Attachment 7).

With prior CDE approval, surplus funds from a given line item of the budget, up to 10 percent of that line item, may be used to defray allowable direct costs under other budget line items. Any budget line item change of more than 10 percent also requires prior CDE approval, a contract amendment, and approval by the California Department of General Services if required by state law or policy. Changes cannot be made that increases the rates of reimbursement.

B. Contract Requirements Related to DVBE Participation Goals

Substitution

- a. After award of a contract, the successful contractor must use the DVBE subcontractor(s) and/or supplier(s) proposed in the solicitation response to the State per Title 2 Section 1896.62 unless a substitution is requested. The contractor must request the substitution in writing to the contract monitor and the CDE must have approved the substitution in writing. At a minimum, the substitution request must include:
 1. A written explanation of the reason for the substitution, and if applicable, the contractor must also include the reason a non-DVBE subcontractor is proposed for use.
 2. A written description of the business enterprise to be substituted, including its business status as a sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, or other entity, and the DVBE certification status of the firm, if any.
 3. A written notice detailing a clearly defined portion of the work identified both as a task and as a percentage share/dollar amount of the overall contract that the substituted firm will perform.
- b. The request for substitution of the DVBE subcontractor/supplier must be approved in writing by the CDE prior to commencement of any work by the subcontractor/supplier.

- c. The request for substitution of a DVBE and the CDE's approval or disapproval cannot be used as an excuse for noncompliance with any other provision of law, including, but not limited to, the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act (Sections 4100 *et seq.*, *Public Contract Code*) or any other contract requirements relating to substitution of subcontractors.
- d. If a contractor requests substitution of its DVBE subcontractor(s)/supplier(s) by providing a written request in accordance with Title 2 *California Code of Regulations*, Section 1896.64(c), the CDE may consent to the substitution of another person as a subcontractor in any of the following situations:
 - 1. When the subcontractor listed in the bid after having had a reasonable opportunity to do so fails or refuses to execute a written contract, when that written contract based upon the general terms, condition, plans and specifications for the project involved or the terms of that subcontractor's written bid, is presented to the subcontractor by the prime contractor.
 - 2. When the listed subcontractor becomes bankrupt or insolvent, or goes out of business.
 - 3. When the listed subcontractor fails or refuses to perform his or her subcontract.
 - 4. When the listed subcontractor fails or refuses to meet the bond requirements of the prime contractor.
 - 5. When the prime contractor demonstrates to the CDE, or its duly authorized officer, that the name of the subcontractor was listed as the result of an inadvertent clerical error.
 - 6. When the listed subcontractor is not licensed pursuant to any applicable licensing requirement of any regulatory agency of the State of California.
 - 7. When the CDE, or its duly authorized officer, determines that the work performed by the listed subcontractor is substantially unsatisfactory and not in substantial accordance with the plans and specifications, or that the subcontractor is substantially delaying or disrupting the process of the work.
- e. Prior to approval of the prime contractor's request for the substitution, the CDE, or its duly authorized officer, shall give notice in writing to the listed subcontractor of the prime contractor's request to substitute and of the reasons for the request. The notice shall be served by certified or registered mail to the last known address of the subcontractor. The listed subcontractor who has been so notified shall have five working days within which to submit written objections to the substitution to the awarding authority. Failure to file these written objections shall constitute the listed subcontractor's consent to the substitution.

- f. If written objections are filed, the CDE shall give notice in writing of at least five working days to the listed subcontractor of a hearing by the CDE on the prime contractor's request for substitution.

The request and the State's approval or disapproval is NOT to be construed as an excuse for noncompliance with any other provision of law, including but not limited to, the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act or any other contract requirements relating to substitution of subcontractors.

Failure to adhere to at least the DVBE participation proposed by the successful bidder may be cause for contract termination and recovery of damages under the rights and remedies due the State under the default section of the contract.

Reporting

The successful contractor must agree to provide reports of actual participation by DVBEs (by dollar amount and category) as may be required by the CDE to document compliance.

Compliance Audit

The contractor must agree that the State or its designee will have the right to review, obtain, and copy all records pertaining to the performance of the contract. The contractor must agree to provide the State, or its designee, with any relevant information requested and shall permit the State, or its designee, access to its premises, upon reasonable notice, during normal business hours, for the purpose of interviewing employees and inspecting and copying such books, records, accounts, and other material that may be relevant to a matter under investigation for the purpose of determining compliance with this requirement. The contractor must further agree to maintain such records for a period of five (5) years after final payment under the contract.

C. Staff Replacements

Changes to the contractor's professional project personnel or management team (e.g., project manager or fiscal officer) require formal approval by CDE's Contract Monitor, and in most cases require a contract amendment and approval by the California Department of General Services. The staffing change may not occur until the contractor receives written approval of the change by CDE's Contract Monitor.

D. Ownership of Materials of the Evaluation

All data collected, the data collection instruments developed, and the reports prepared for and submitted to the CDE under the terms of this agreement are the sole property of the California Department of Education. The contractor will deliver all data to CDE or its agent within 15 calendar days of the date requested. The CDE reserves the exclusive right to copyright such materials and to publish, disseminate, and otherwise use materials developed under the terms of this contract. Any use of these materials by the contractor for reasons separate from completion of the contract requirements, during or subsequent to the contract period, may be done only with written permission of the

CDE. It is incumbent upon the contractor to secure such permission. The bidder must include in the proposal cover letter a statement certifying comprehension of and compliance with these provisions.

E. Retention of Records

The contractor shall maintain accounting records and other evidence pertaining to costs incurred, with provision that they be kept available during the contract period and thereafter for five full years from the date of the final payment. The CDE must be permitted to audit, review, and inspect the contractor's activities, books, documents, papers, and records during progress of the work and for five years following final payment.

F. Ownership of Equipment

Purchase of equipment is not permitted under this contract.

G. National Labor Relations Board of Certification

By signing the contract, the contractor swears under penalty of perjury that no more than one final un-appealable finding of contempt of courts by a federal court has been issued against the contractor within the immediately preceding two-year period because of the contractor's failure to comply with an order of a Federal Court that orders the contractor to comply with an order of the National Labor Relations Board. (This provision is not applicable to public agencies.)

H. Anti-Trust Claims (Government Code Sections 4552-4554)

In submitting a bid to a public purchasing body, the bidder offers and agrees that if the bid is accepted, it will assign to the purchasing body all rights, title and interest in and to all causes of action it may have under Section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 USC Section 15) or under the Cartwright Act (Chapter 2) commencing with Section 16700 of Part 2 of Division 7 of the Business and Professions Code, arising from purchases of goods, materials or services by the bidder for sale to the purchasing body pursuant to the bid. Such assignment shall be made and become effective at the time the purchasing body receives, either through judgment or settlement, a monetary recovery for a cause of action assigned under this chapter, the assignor shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for actual legal costs incurred and may, upon demand, recover from the public body any portion of the recovery, including treble damages, attributable to overcharges that were paid by the assignor but were not paid by the public body as part of the bid price, less the expenses incurred in obtaining that portion of the recovery. Upon demand in writing by the assignor, the assignor shall, within one year from such demand, reassign the cause of action assigned under this part if the assignor has been or may have been injured by the violation of law for which the cause of action arose and (a) the assignee has not been injured thereby, or (b) the assignee declines to file a court action for the cause of action.

I. Recycled Paper Certification (Public Contract Code Section 10308.5/10354)

By signing the contract, the contractor agrees to certify in writing to the CDE, under penalty of perjury, the minimum, if not exact, percentage of recycled content, both post-

consumer material and secondary material as defined in Public Contract Code Sections 12161 and 12200, in materials, goods or supplies offered or products used in the performance of the contract, regardless of whether the product meets the required recycled product percentage as defined in Sections 12161 and 12200. The contractor may certify that the product contains zero recycled content.

J. Air or Water Pollution Violations (Government Code Section 4477)

By signing the contract, the contractor swears under penalty of perjury that the contractor is not 1) in violation of any order or resolution not subject to review promulgated by the State Air Resources Board or an air pollution control district; 2) subject to a cease-and-desist order not subject to review issued pursuant to Section 13301 of the Water Code for violation of waste discharge requirements or discharge prohibition; or 3) determined to be in violation of provisions of federal law relating to air or water pollution. This provision does not apply to public agencies.

K. Child Support Compliance (Public Contract Code Section 7110)

By signing this agreement, the contractor acknowledges that a) it recognizes the importance of child and family support obligations and shall fully comply with all applicable state and federal laws relating to child and family support enforcement including, but not limited to, disclosure of information and compliance with earnings assignment orders as provided in Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 5200) of Part 5 of Division 9 of Family Code; and b) to the best of its knowledge it is fully complying with the earning assignment order of all employees and is providing the names of all new employees to the New Hire Registry maintained by the California Employment Development Department.

L. Computer Software Copyright Compliance

By signing this agreement, the contractor certifies that it has appropriate systems and controls in place to ensure that state funds will not be used in the contract for the acquisition, operation or maintenance of computer software in violation of copyright laws.

M. Union Organizing and Activities

By signing the contract, the contractor acknowledges the applicability to the contract of Government Code Section 16645 through Section 16649. The contractor will not assist, promote or deter union organizing by employees performing work on a state service contract, including a public works contract. No state funds received under this agreement will be used to assist, promote or deter union organizing. The contractor will not, for any business conducted under this agreement, use any state property to hold meetings with employees or supervisors if the purpose of such meetings is to assist, promote or deter union organizing, unless the state property is equally available to the general public for holding meetings. If the contractor incurs costs or makes expenditures to assist, promote or deter union organizing, the contractor will maintain records sufficient to show that no reimbursement from state funds has been sought for these costs. The contractor shall provide these records to the Attorney General upon request.

By signing the contract, the contractor hereby certifies that no request for reimbursement or payment under this agreement will seek reimbursement for costs incurred to assist, promote or deter union organizing.

N. Access to Pupil Records; Confidentiality

Access to individual pupil records of the results of academic achievement tests administered pursuant to Education Code Section 60640 [the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program], is authorized under Education Code Section 49076(a)(3) (school districts shall permit access to pupil records by state education officials or their designees where the information is necessary to evaluate a state-supported education program pursuant to state law).

The CDE can provide the successful bidder with access to individual pupil records stripped of all personal identifiers. To the extent it may be necessary for the contractor to obtain additional information from LEAs, the contractor should be aware that school districts cannot grant access to individual pupil records of STAR test results without the expressed written consent of the parent or guardian of the pupil (Education Code Section 60607[d] and 6064[c]).

By signing the contract, the contractor acknowledges that they must provide a written assurance that the data will be managed in accordance with all applicable federal and California state privacy laws including, but not limited to: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1984 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g) and Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA), and California Education Code Sections 49069 to 49079. No STAR test scores that may be obtained for use in this evaluation shall be reported electronically, in hard copy, or in other media, to any audience, if the aggregate or group school is composed of ten (10) or fewer individual pupil scores. In each instance in which no score is reported for this reason, the notation shall appear "The number of pupils in this category is too small for statistically accuracy or privacy protection." In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual pupil.

The U.S. Department of Education regulations at 34 CFR 97.103(a) require that each institution "engaged" in human subjects research provide an assurance to comply with the regulations and obtain Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, unless the research is exempt under 34 CFR 97.101(b). Thus, the contractor must be prepared to collaborate with the CDE staff in the development of the human subjects protocol and to outline the proposed process to obtain approval from the applicant's IRB for conducting the proposed research at the time the award is made.

In addition, the contractor will be expected to demonstrate that it has taken specific steps to ensure the data are kept secure and confidential as evidenced by, at a minimum, the following:

- Each and every employee, subcontractor, or other person who has access to personal information is required to sign a statement that they understand that the

information is personal and they will take steps to ensure that unauthorized personnel do not gain access to personal data.

- Personal data, while being transmitted electronically, must be encrypted.
- Any repository for the data will be locked and have access restricted to those personnel that have a legitimate need to access the data and have signed a confidentiality agreement.

Any security breach must be reported to the CDE immediately.

The CDE considers mailing information (including an e-mail address) to be personal (private). As such, if the contractor asks a person for his or her mailing information, the contractor must make it clear to the person providing the information whether the information will be shared with any organization other than the CDE and the contractor. In addition, the contractor will provide the person providing the mailing information an “opt-out” (i.e., the person can elect not to have his or her mailing information shared with organizations outside of CDE and the contractor).

O. Publishing Results of the Evaluation

The contractor may publish the results of this work in professional journals or present the results at conferences and meetings with the approval of the CDE and the State Board of Education. Such publication or presentations may occur only after involvement and discussion with the CDE to ensure appropriate protection of all districts, schools, and individuals involved, as well as appropriate timing of the release of the information. The bidder must address anticipated professional group dissemination venues and strategies in their Work Plan in the bidder’s proposal.

VIII. Proposal Evaluation Process

Each proposal will be evaluated to determine responsiveness to the requirements and standards as well as format and content requirements as described in this RFP.

The proposal must be submitted in two parts: technical proposal and cost proposal.

The CDE reserves the right to reject any or all proposals. Nothing herein requires the awarding of a contract in response to this RFP. The selection process complies with the requirements for competitive bidding in the State Public Contract Code Section 10344(b) requiring prospective bidders to submit their technical proposals and proposed budgets.

Following the time and date for receipt of proposals, each technical proposal will be opened and evaluated in a two-step process. Step I consists of three parts.

Step I, Part 1 Adherence to Proposal Requirements. Proposals will be evaluated on a yes/no basis for all criteria in the first part of Step 1. Receipt of a “no” on any item will result in elimination of the proposal from further consideration.

Step 1, Part 2 Minimum Qualifications. Proposals will be evaluated on a yes/no basis for all criteria in the second part of Step 1. Receipt of a “no” on any item will result in elimination of the proposal from further consideration.

Step I, Part 3 Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria, shall yield numeric score ratings. A review panel will rate proposals on criteria described in the technical proposal section. Any technical proposal receiving a rating of less than 90 points will be rejected.

Step II of the process is the public opening of the envelope containing the cost/price proposal. Only those proposals passing the first step of the process will have the cost/price proposal envelopes opened and read. The public opening of the cost/price proposals for those passing all aspects of Step I will be held:

10:00 AM, Thursday, September 30, 2004

California Department of Education
Policy and Evaluation Division
Evaluation, Research and Analysis Unit
1430 N Street, Suite 4206
Sacramento, CA 95814

The CDE will review the cost proposals for compliance with the standards and requirements in the RFP. The cost proposals will be reviewed, including a comparison of the hours in the cost proposal with the hours in the management and staffing component of the technical proposal.

The Small Business Preference will be computed if required documentation is included in the proposal and adjustments to bid prices will be made accordingly. The contract will be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder meeting the specifications described above.

In the event of a two-way (or more) tie of the responsive lowest bid, the method that shall be used as a “tie-breaker” will be to place the names of the bidders in a container to be drawn. The first name drawn will be the proposed awardee.

A notice of the proposed contractor to receive the award will be posted for five working days beginning October 1, 2004 in the lobby of the CDE, 1430 N Street, Sacramento, CA 95814, and on CDE’s Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/>.

During the same period, proposals and rating sheets will be available for public inspection *during normal business hours* at the Policy and Evaluation Division, 1430 N

Street, Suite 4206, Sacramento, CA 95814. After the five-day notice period has passed, the proposed awardee will be formally notified.

IX. Contract Award Protest Procedures

If prior to the formal award, any bidder files a protest with the California Department of General Services against the awarding of the contract, the contract shall not be awarded until either the protest has been withdrawn or the California Department of General Services has decided the matter. Within five days after filing the protest, the protesting bidder shall file with the California Department of General Services a full and complete written statement specifying the grounds for the protest. Protests shall be limited to those specified in Public Contract Code Section 10345 (Attachment 4).

X. Rating Criteria And Evaluation Form^{*}

Step 1 Part 1-Adherence to Proposal Requirements (Rated on a **Yes/No** basis)

A proposal that receives a “No” in any of the following criteria will be eliminated from further consideration.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 1. Letter of Intent received by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, August 16, 2004. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 2. The Cover Letter |
| | a. Is signed by the individual qualified to make the offer on behalf of the organization. The individual signing the letter indicates their position title and certifies that he or she is authorized to make the offer on behalf of the organization. (Section V, Part C of the RFP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | b. Acknowledgement that all data collected, the data collection instruments developed, and reports prepared for, and submitted to the CDE are the sole property of the California Department of Education. (Section VII, Part D of the RFP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> NA | c. If applicable, the bidder specifies the strategies to be used to obtain confidential pupil records, maintain their confidentiality, and dispose of such information at the conclusion of the evaluation study. (Section VII, Part N of the RFP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | d. Attests that the bidder is a public or private corporation, agency, organization or association that is legally constituted and qualified to do business within the State of California. (Section IV, Part A of the RFP) |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | e. Identifies acceptance of the contract terms and requirements as specified in this RFP. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 3. One original and nine copies of the technical proposal received by 10:00 a.m., Friday, September 24, 2004. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 4. The bidder DOES NOT include the budget or any related financial information with the technical proposal. (Section V, Part D of the RFP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 5. The cost/price proposal was submitted in a separate sealed envelope. (Section V, Part D of the RFP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | 6. The outside of the sealed envelope containing the cost/price bid information reads: |

*Evaluation Study of California's High Priority Schools Grant Program
Competitive Bid*

Do not open before 10:00 am, Thursday, September 30, 2004.
(Section V, Part D of the RFP)

- ☐ Yes ☐ No
7. Proposal submitted in required format with required sections.
(Section V, Part C of the RFP)
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
8. Required forms submitted with each copy of the technical proposal:
- a. Completed Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement: the Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement (Attachment 1) is signed and dated with the original signature with each copy of the proposal;
- b. Small Business Preference Sheet (Attachment 2) completed and a copy of the OSDC certification letter included if the preference is being claimed, or the date of application if not yet certified;
- c. DVBE Participation Goals must have all of the following:

- ☐ Yes ☐ No Attachment 3 California DVBE Program Requirements

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA
- Attachment 3-A Documentation of DVBE Program Requirements

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA CDE Contracts Office has determined compliance with DVBE participation goals.

- ☐ Yes ☐ No d. Certification Regarding California Drug-Free Workplace (Attachment 5) [Note: This form needs not to be completed and returned with the proposal. However, certification is a condition of receipt of the contract.]
- ☐ Yes ☐ No e. Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension, and other Responsibility Matters (Attachment 6)
- ☐ Yes ☐ No f. Resumes or curriculum vitae for key personnel included with attachments (Section V, Part C of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No g. Commitment letters, resumes, and qualifications of all subcontractors including DVBES.
9. The proposal is limited to 35 double-spaced pages in no smaller than 10-point font. (The 35-page limit applies to the General Approach, Work Plan, Detailed Evaluation Study Design, Management and Staffing, and Related Experience.) (Section V, Part C of the RFP)
- ☐ Yes ☐ No 10. Materials and/or descriptions listed below including:
- ☐ Yes ☐ No a. The *General Approach* provides an overview of the approach to be taken in addressing the five evaluation questions described in the Scope of the HPSGP Evaluation Study (Section III of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No b. The *Work Plan* describes the tasks and activities to be undertaken in order to accomplish the scope and purpose of the project and produce the required final products (Section V, Part C of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No c. The *Detailed Evaluation Study Design* provides a description of the two-year activities of the evaluation study based on information from this RFP and must include activities related to answering the five evaluation questions (Section III, Part B and Section V, Part C of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No d. *Management and Staffing* presents a plan for the internal management of contract work that will ensure accomplishment of the tasks (Section V, part C of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No e. Related Experience describes the experience of the bidder in providing services required, including discussion of previous related work (Section V, Part C of the RFP).

- ☐ Yes ☐ No f. A current organization chart indicating staff by name that will be assigned to this project and the amount of time devoted to each task, along with a list of responsibilities and approval authority (Section V, Part C of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No g. At least two samples of an evaluation study design and their accompanying final evaluation reports developed and prepared by the bidder. The bidder provides at least three copies of such products with the technical proposal (Section V, Part C of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No h. At least three client references relevant to the scope and complexity of the services required by the RFP. These references include a description of the services performed, the date of these services and the name, address and telephone number of the client reference (Section V, Part C of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No i. Strategies to obtain STAR results and other relevant data from selected districts, schools, and students that can be matched longitudinally from year to year (Section III, Part B of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No j. If applicable, letters of commitment from proposed subcontractor(s) (Section V, Part C of the RFP).

Step 1 Part 2 – Minimum Qualifications (Rated on a Yes/No basis)

Did the bidder show clear evidence of meeting the following conditions?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No 1. The bidder must show clear evidence of a minimum of two years of recent (one of which must be within the last three years) experience in the development and operation of projects similar to that described in this RFP (Section III, Part C of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No 2. The Project Manager assigned to this project must have at least two years of recent experience (one of which must be within the last three years) in managing similar projects of comparable scope and size(Section III, Part C of this RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No 3. The bidder clearly documents experience with and/or knowledge of:
- a. Quantitative research, especially sampling methodology, statistical analysis, interpretation of standardized tests, and other student achievement data.
 - b. Existing achievement data in California schools and the uses thereof for the student impact, benefit, and academic

achievement analysis sought in this RFP.

- c. Qualitative research, especially survey, on-site observational, interview, case study, focus group data collection methodologies, and content analysis.
- d. Performance of research in low achieving schools.
- e. Current research and literature about school reform and statewide comprehensive, high-stakes school accountability systems (Section V, Part C of the RFP).

A Proposal that receives a “No” in any of the above criteria will be eliminated from further consideration.

Step 1 Part 3 – Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria (100 points)

A panel will review the technical proposals on the criteria listed below. The proposal score will be based upon the adequacy and thoroughness of responses to the RFP requirements. Any proposal receiving less than 90 points will be rejected.

- _____ 1. Degree of Understanding of the Project (10 points)
 - _____ a. Degree of understanding of the purpose of the project demonstrated by the bidder (4 points).
 - _____ b. Degree of understanding of the scope of the project demonstrated by the bidder (3 points).
 - _____ c. Degree of understanding of high poverty, low performing schools and the needs of students in such schools (3 points).
- _____ 2. Technical Quality of Evaluation Study Design and Work Plan (55 points)
 - _____ a. Clarity and feasibility of the work plan, and its responsiveness to the requirements of the RFP(10 points).
 - _____ b. Appropriateness and comprehensiveness of the evaluation study design in addressing and answering the evaluation questions in the RFP, especially proposed methodologies both quantitative and qualitative, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis for gathering and analyzing required data, including student achievement data, drawing conclusions, and producing findings and recommendations from the data (15 points).

- _____ c. Degree to which the bidder addresses indicators, confounding variables and data, including clear descriptions of, and rationales for, augmented data collection procedures and measures to be used (5 points).
- _____ d. Degree to which the bidder discusses use of available data to answer the five evaluation questions, other proposed data sources to augment CDE data, and conceptual or methodological problems surrounding the project with sound proposed solutions (in that a detailed data analysis plan justifies and explains the selected analytical strategy, shows clearly how the measures and analysis related to the evaluation questions, and indicates how the results will be interpreted) (5 points).
- _____ e. Degree to which the bidder addresses coordination with CDE staff and consultation with the HPSGP Evaluation Advisory Group (5 points).
- _____ f. Extent to which the bidder discusses how the study will provide information about the implementation, impact, costs, and benefits of the HPSGP and will make recommendations about the program (10 points).
- _____ g. Extent to which the bidder indicates how and when contractor products and reports will be prepared and furnished to the CDE and other pertinent audiences (5 points).
- _____ 3. Adequacy of Management and Staffing Plan (10 points)
- _____ a. Quality of the overall project and company management plans and the degree to which they ensure the efficient operation of the project to fulfill the contract requirements and to accomplish project tasks, including lines of responsibility and approval authority, the name of the person to serve as project director, and reporting relationships within the project and the company (5 points).
- _____ b. The quality and appropriateness of the project organization and staffing, and the extent to which they reflect adequate time commitments to each project task, name assigned project staff for each task, draw upon staff's similar past experience to undertake assigned tasks, and indicate the relationship of each position to the work plan as illustrated in the staff organizational chart (5 points).
- _____ 4. Experience and Expertise of Proposed Staff (15 points)

- _____ a. Appropriateness and applicability of the experience and expertise of the proposed staff for the design and implementation of this project (5 points).
- _____ b. The extent to which the resumes or curriculum vitae of proposed staff to fill the professional positions allow for evaluation of the competency, experience, and expertise of these individuals (5 points).
- _____ c. The extent to which the Related Experience section adequately describes the experience of the bidder in providing the services required in this RFP, and the extent to which it addresses the specific experience and expertise requirements to meet the Minimum Qualifications and Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria described in this RFP (5 points).
- _____ 5. Previous Work and Reference (10 points)
- _____ a. The quality of the previous work samples submitted, the degree to which they reflect sound organization, clear logic, overall readability, and relevance to the proposed project, and the extent to which problems are clearly stated, alternatives explored, and logical solutions presented (5 points).
- _____ b. The strength of client references, the relevance of the work performed to the scope and complexity required for this RFP, and the completeness and relevance of references, including a description of the services performed, the data of these services, and the purposes for which the services were rendered (5 points).

Step II Public Opening of the Envelope Containing the Cost/Price Proposal

Proposals advance to this step if they scored 90 points (90%) and above on the technical proposal. A CDE representative will open the sealed cost/price proposal publicly as specified in Section VIII, Step II.

- ☐ Yes ☐ No 1. One (1) original and nine (9) copies of cost proposal were received by 10 a.m., Friday, September 24, 2004 (Section V, Part A of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No 2. The Cost/Price proposal contains, at a minimum, the following information:
- ☐ Yes ☐ No a. The bidder includes the cost/price proposal of all costs for convening required meetings, including the travel costs for members (Section V, Part D).

- ☐ Yes ☐ No b. Labor cost detail, including hourly or billing rates for all personnel and the total number of hours projected for this project, agree with staff hours in the technical proposal and with the DVBE submissions (Section V, Part D of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No c. Operating expense detail for line items of \$500 or more including travel, computer software, and the bidder's indirect costs (IDC) for the proposed activities (Section V, Part D of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No d. Travel expenses computed and reimbursed, per state travel costs in compliance with State Travel Reimbursement Rates (Attachment 7) (Section V, Part D of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No e. Identification of costs by task and by total for each year and for the entire project (Section V, Part d of the RFP).
- ☐ Yes ☐ No f. Any subcontractor expenses are detailed including verification of amount identified for DVBE participation (Section V, Part D of the RFP).